7-4-81

Dear Nancy,

Thank for your letter. I am glad you found ~~the~~ ~~for~~ my paper of interest. With regard to your query about S, I can set sure that I have quite understood the point you are making here. You appear to be claiming that, [illegible] by altering the macroscopic arrangement of the box, doing or shutting it, a non-local effect can be produced to change the classical state of the cat from alive to dead or vice versa.

My comments on this suggestion would be as follows

1.) The violation of locality, indicated by the Bell argument (~~can only~~) only occurs in certain special circumstances, for example when the knob-setting on Alice's B alters the printer-reading on Alice's A, when the Alice-meters are devices for measuring at least two non-commuting observables associated with each system and the state of the combined system at the moment

case of the perfect ($\bar{J}=0$) ? fale. The ST does not follow that locality$_4$ is violated in any circumstance in that it is not proved specifically that violation must occur by a Bell-type argument. Now the Schrödinger cat case is ~~quite different~~ similar to Bell in defining a combined state of alive + cat which establishes a correlation between dead/alive cat and decay/nondecay of the atom. But unlike Bell it does not introduce additional non-commuting observables. The alive/dead ~~can be~~ is compatible with the decay/nondecay question and all observables for the cat ~~that do not commute~~ ~~with~~ to the alive/dead question, for a st. clear that upon a shake the bad corresponds to a change in the expression context for measurements in the atom which is what is used additional requires to demonstrate a nonlocal effect in the state of annihilation of the cat!

2.) Let us suppose that a non-local effect of mind etc-bed of the cat loaded down demanded on the presence of some mereological entities called variables c which states (+1) and (−1) just that if c=+1 the cat remains alive but if c=−1 a catastrophic effect (we can use the hammer) occurs, i.e. the death of the cat is triggered. If c changes from (+1) to (−1) we have a certain killed the cat at a distance. But it does not follow that if c changes from (−1) to (+1) the cat is resurrected. This is because, as is usual in catastrophe theory, small changes in the control variable do not lead to reversible changes in the variables. Thus suppose two books A, B are lying on a table with B balanced at the edge. If S moves A to the edge, B falls off, but if S moves A back again B does not leap again to the table. All that I can say is that if

A had never offended do obj, B
seemed not have fallen.

I feel, however, that your
paper about 8 is probably not
what I have been communicating on!
I enclose the proposal you asked
for, also another paper which deals
to appear in Foundations of
Physics, and which I also
referred to in my EPR paper.
If I can be of any further
assistance do let me know.
It was very pleased that the P.I.
is going on sabbatical to pursue
philosophy & science & perhaps - perhaps
we can persuade them etc the problems
really are both interesting and challenging!
Well best wishes
Yours sincerely

3) Force to [illegible] effect of reduced by reduction of wealth, we could not pay debt, pay old debts, pulled the act, force there would be an many interest where pay, old debt elapsed the

PS. Reading about [illegible] love incident it occurs to me that you could be doubt to refer (culture) to the very of Monbrede to Lucas B, that open up the box and [illegible] covers the state of the cat from a [illegible] Monbrede to a deceased blind dead.